

## REMARKS

### Introduction

Claims 21 to 35 are now in this application, claims 2 to 20 having been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. For the reasons set forth below, the applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable.

### **Claims 21 to 35 Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>ND</sup> Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 2 to 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>ND</sup> paragraph. The Examiner asserted that those claims did not adequately specify the interrelationship between recited claim elements. In addition, the Examiner asserted that some terminology, e.g., “experience”, “provide”, and “enabling” made the claims unclear.

Rather than amend the claims, applicant submits new claims which are intended to be of similar scope to the original claims while more clearly and specifically defining the interrelationship between claim elements. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 21 to 35 fully comply with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, including those of paragraph two of that section of the code.

### **Claims 21 to 35 are Patentable Over U.S.P.N. 6,169,498**

The Examiner rejected claims 2 to 20 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,498 to King et al. (the “King patent”) It is respectfully submitted that both the prior claims and new claims 21 to 35 are not anticipated by the King patent which does not address presenting supplemental information to a visitor of a public space after the visitor has left that space.

Independent claims 2, 10 and 19 all included the notion that certain information was accessible by or to a visitor of a public space after the visitor had left the space. A similar notion has been maintained in all of the new independent claims 21, 29, 34 and 35.

This distinction between certain operations within the public space and those occurring outside the public space is not disclosed in the King patent at all. The cited reference concerns itself with the distribution of information to a user while the user is in a given public space. The King patent does not disclose or suggest the additional accessibility of a transmission to a visitor

after the visitor has left the public space. Thus, each of the independent claims patentably define the present invention of the patent to King et al. The Examiner is respectfully directed to the "sending" processes of claims 21 and 29, the receiving an electronic inquiry and responding to said inquiry in claim 35 and the external information transmission system of claim 34 of examples of claim elements that make this distinction very clear.

In view of the shortcomings of the King patent, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### **Conclusion**


Claims 21-35 have been submitted in place of claims 2 to 20 to assure that the claims adequately address the ambiguity concerns raised by the Examiner. Claims 21-35, like claims 2 to 20, patentably define the invention over the prior art. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all of the outstanding rejections. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

Dated: April 19, 2004

Cooley Godward LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
One Freedom Square  
Reston Town Center  
11951 Freedom Drive  
Reston, VA 20190-5656  
Tel: (703) 456-8000  
Fax: (703) 456-8100

Respectfully submitted,  
**COOLEY GODWARD LLP**

By:   
Frank Pietrantonio  
Reg. No. 32,289